diagnosis given by Linnaeus, " *Muraena ophis.* 2. M. cauda aptera cuspidata, corpore tereti ". Except in six cases the binomen is in no way distinguished from the diagnosis, either typographically or by punctuation, and it seems doubtful from the text whether Cornide had more than a loose conception of binominal nomenclature.

9. Accordingly, I request the International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature to take the following action:

(1) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Arengus* as rejected as published in a non-binominal work;

(2) to place on the Official Index of Rejected Specific Names in Zoology the name *minor*, as published in the combination *Arengus minor* and rejected as published in a non-binominal work;

(3) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, *Sardina* Antipa, 1904, type species by monotypy *Sardina dobrogica* Antipa, 1904. [= *Sardina pilchardus* (Walbaum, 1792)];

(4) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, *pilchardus* Walbaum, 1792, as published in the combination *Clupea pilchardus* Walbaum, 1792;

(5) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature, the publication of Cornide, J., 1788, Ensayo de una historia de los Peces y otras producciones marinas de la Costa de Galicia, arreglado al sistema del caballero Carlos Linneo . . . [264 pages], [Corunna] (a work in which the author did not consistently apply the principles of binominal nomenclature).

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED RULING ON THE TYPE-SPECIES OF *SCIAENA* LINNAEUS, 1758 Z.N.(S.) 850

(see volume 20, pages 349–360)

By E. Tortonese (*Museo Civico di Storia Naturale, Genova, Italy*)

As a student of the living fishes, I was especially interested in E. Trewavas' paper on *Sciaena.*

As the few Sciaenidae living in the Mediterranean are well-known and economically important species, it is very important to have their names fixed; we have too often had changes, and stability is highly desired by students and others.

Therefore, may I support Trewavas' action. Having personally considered this question, I think that the species involved must be so named: *Sciaena umbra*, *Umbrina cirrosa*, *Argyrosomus regius.* Alternative (i) as explained on page 353 of the paper quoted above, is therefore preferred. It also has the advantage of avoiding such names as " Coracinus umbra " and " Sciaena cirrosa " that are definitely unfamiliar to the Mediterranean student; with alternative (i) we may reach stability according to the rules and avoid too drastic changes.